

CPEL0150739

Patent Office of the People's Republic of China

Address : Receiving Section of the Chinese Patent Office, No. 6 Tucheng Road West, Haidian District, Beijing. Postal code: 100088

| | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| Applicant | NOKIA MOBILE PHONES LTD. | | Seal of Examiner | Date of Issue |
| Agent | China Patent Agent (H.K.) Ltd. | | | March 26, 2004 |
| Patent Application No. | 01117330.0 | Application Date | March 9, 2001 | Exam Dept. |
| Title of Invention | TRANSCEIVER INTERFACE REDUCTION | | | |

First Office Action

1. ☒ Pursuant to the provision of Article 35 (1) of the Chinese Patent Law, the examiner made an examination as to substance of the captioned patent application for invention upon the request for substantive examination filed by the applicant.

☐ Pursuant to the provision of Article 35 (2) of the Chinese Patent Law, the Chinese Patent Office has decided to conduct on its own initiative an examination as to substance of the captioned patent application for invention.

2. ☒ The applicant requests taking the filing date, March 10, 2000, at the UK Patent Office, the filing date, _____, at the _____ Patent Office, the filing date, _____, at the _____ Patent Office as the priority date of the present application.

☒ A copy of the first filed patent application certified by the receiving organ of the initial country of filing has been submitted by the applicant.

☐ A copy of the first filed patent application certified by the receiving organ of the initial country of filing has not been submitted by the applicant. Pursuant to the provision of Article 30 of the Chinese Patent Law, no priority right shall be deemed to have been claimed.

3. ☐ The applicant filed amended application document(s) on _____ and _____.

☐ Examination has confirmed that _____ filed on _____ cannot be accepted, _____ filed on _____ cannot be accepted,

 as the above amendment(s) ☐ is/are not in conformity with the provision of Article 33 of the Chinese Patent Law.

☐ is/are not in conformity with the provision of Rule 51 of the Implementing Regulations of the Chinese Patent Law.

☐ For the specific reason that the amendment(s) cannot be accepted, see the text of the Office Action.

4. ☒ The examination is conducted in the light of the original application document(s)
☐ The examination is conducted in the light of the following application document(s):
in the original application documents submitted on the filing date:
Claim(s) _____, page(s) _____ of the description, Figure(s)
of the drawing(s); Claim(s) _____, page(s) _____ of the description,
Figure(s) _____ submitted on _____; Claim(s) _____, page (s)
of the description, Figure(s) _____ submitted on _____
☐ Abstract of the description submitted on _____.
5. ☐ The present Office Action has been prepared without a search having been conducted.
☒ The present Office Action has been prepared with a search having been conducted.
☒ The following reference document(s) is/are cited in this Office Action (its/their serial number(s) will, continue to be used throughout the examination procedure):

| No. | Number or Title of Document | Date of Publication (or filing date of interfering application) |
|-----|-----------------------------|--|
| 1 | CN85203852U | (Date) January 7, 1987 |
| 2 | | (Date) |
| 3 | | (Date) |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | | |
| 6 | | |

6. The concluding comments of the examiner are:

- ☒ On the description:
☐ The content of the application comes within the scope where no patent right is granted as provided in Article 5 of the Patent Law.
☐ The description is not in conformity with the provision of Article 26(3) of the Patent Law.
☒ The drafting of the description is not in conformity with the provision of Rule 18 of the Implementing Regulations.
- ☒ On the claims:
☐ Claim comes within the scope where no patent right is granted as provided in Article 25 of the Patent Law.
☐ Claim is not in conformity with the definition of invention in Rule 2(1) of the Implementing Regulations.
☐ Claim _____ does not possess novelty as provided in Article 22(2) of the Patent Law.
☒ Claim 1-4 does not possess inventiveness as provided in Article 22(3) of the Patent Law.
☐ Claim _____ does not possess practical applicability as provided in Article 22(4) of the Patent Law.
☒ Claim 2 is not in conformity with the provision of Article 26(4) of the Patent

Law.

- ☐ Claim _____ is not in conformity with the provision of Article 31(1) of the Patent Law.
- ☒ Claim 2, 5, 7, 8, 9 is not in conformity with the provisions of Rules 20-23 of the Implementing Regulations.
- ☐ Claim _____ is not in conformity with the provision of Article 9 of the Patent Law.
- ☐ Claim _____ is not in conformity of the provision of Rule 12(1) of the Implementing Regulations.

For specific analyses of the above concluding comments, see the text of this Office Action.

7. In view of the above concluding comments, the examiner holds that:

- ☐ The applicant should amend the application document in accordance with the requirements raised in the text of this Office Action. The amended document(s) should be submitted in duplicate and should conform to the provisions of Article 33 of the Patent Law and Rule 51 of the Implementing Regulations of the Chinese Patent Law.
- ☒ The applicant should expound in his Observations the reasons why the captioned patent application is patentable and amend the places not conforming to regulations as pointed out in the text of the Office Action, otherwise it would be impossible for the patent right to be granted.
- ☐ The captioned patent application contains no substantive content for which the patent right may be granted, thus if the applicant has not advanced his reasons or has not done so adequately, the application will be rejected.

8. The applicant should pay attention to the following matters:

- (1) In accordance with the provision of Article 37 of the Patent Law, the applicant should submit his/its Observations within **four** months from the date of receipt of this Office Action; if, without any justified reason, the time limit for making response is not met, the application will be deemed to have been withdrawn.
- (2) The amendments made by the applicant to his application should conform to the provision of Article 33 of the Patent Law, the amended text should be in duplicate and the format should conform to the relevant provisions of the Guidelines for Examination.
- (3) The applicant's Observations or amended text should be mailed or presented to the Receiving Section of the Chinese Patent Office. Document no mailed or presented to the Acceptance Section have no legal force.
- (4) Without making an appointment, the applicant and/or agent may not come to the Chinese Patent Office to hold an interview with the examiner.

9. This Office Action consists of the text portion totalling 3 page(s) and of the following annex(es):

- ☒ 1 duplicate copies of the reference document(s) cited totalling 9 page(s).
- ☐
- ☐

First Office Action

(I)

1. Claims 5, 7, 8, 9 do not comply with rule 20.1 of the Implementing Regulations of the Patent Law.

(1) (This item relates to the expression in the Chinese version, which will be dealt with by us—the agent’s note.)

(2) Claim 5 is an independent claim, and its tech-feature includes a transceiver interface as claimed in any one of claims 1 to 4. The reference level of said statement is confused, which makes the protection scope of said claim unclear.

Besides, claim 7 further refers to claim 5 or 6, which makes the reference level of claim 7 confused, and results in that the protection scope of said claim unclear. It is suggested that when amending claim 5, the applicant should state the characterizing portion completely, and do not use the statement such as “including a transceiver interface as claimed in claim 1 or 2” to avoid the confusion of the reference level of its dependent claim 7.

Similarly, claim 8 is an independent claim, and the reference relationship of the statement in its characterizing portion is confused, which makes the protection scope of said claim unclear.

(3) The meaning of said “as dependent therefrom” in claim 8 is uncertain,

which makes the protection scope of said claim unclear.

The meaning of said “mobile telephony functions” in claim 8 is unclear.

(4) The meaning of said “substantially as described herein with reference to figure 5 and figure 6 of the accompanying drawings” in claim 9 is unclear.

2. (This item relates to the expression in the Chinese version, which will be dealt with by us—the agent’s note.)

3. Claim 4 is a multiple dependent claim, and claim 3 it refers to is also a multiple dependent claim, hence, claim 4 does not comply with rule 23.2 of the Implementing Regulations of the Patent Law which stipulates that any multiple dependent claims shall not serve as a basis for any other multiple dependent claims.

Besides, claim 4 does not refer to the preceding claim in the alternative, which does not comply with rule 23.2 of the Implementing Regulations of the Patent Law.

4. Claim 9 lacks the indispensable tech-features for solving the tech-problem, which does not comply with rule 21.2 of the Implementing Regulations of the Patent Law. Claim 9 claims a transceiver interface, but said claim does not state any tech-features of the interface.

5. Even if the applicant amends the claims according to the comments, the examiner still has the following comments:

1) Claim 1 claims a transceiver interface. Ref. 1 (p. 5 of the description and fig. 1) discloses a communication interface of a general mini printer and the following: the communication interface includes a NOR gate with three inputs, said communication interface can be connected to a printing cable which is connected to a computer, said communication interface includes a input part for receiving signals from the printing cable, and a logic circuit—a NOR gate connected to the input part, and has a single logic output line, it is known to those skilled in the art: in connection with the NOR gate circuit, if P is a proposition, Q is a proposition, and R is a proposition..., when all the propositions are false, the result of the NOR operation of P, Q, R will be true; if at least one of the propositions is true, then, the result of the operation will be false, which is equivalent to that the logic circuit has a first output state (true) and a second output state (false) in claim 1, when in the first output state, both signals are below a predetermined level (P, Q, R are false), while in the second output state, either or both signals exceed the predetermined level (at least one of the propositions P, Q, R is true).

The difference between claim 1 and ref. 1 lies in: in claim 1, two signals are transmitted to the logic circuit, while in ref. 1, three signals are

transmitted to the NOR gate. However, those skilled in the art can decide the number of the inputs of the NOR gate according to the number of signals actually required. It can be learned that it is obvious that those skilled in the art can obtain the tech-solution in said claim on the basis of ref. 1 and in combination with the general knowledge, hence, said claim does not possess any prominent substantive feature, nor does it represent any notable progress, and does not have inventiveness of art. 22.3 of the Patent Law.

2) The additional feature in claim 2 is disclosed in ref. 1 (see the comments on claim 1). When claim 1 referred to has no inventiveness, claim 2 does not have inventiveness of art. 22.3 of the Patent Law either.

3) The additional feature in claim 3 is disclosed in ref. 1. When the input signals are false (single ended zero state), the output from the NOR gate will be true (the first output state). When claim 1 or 2 referred to has no inventiveness, claim 3 does not have inventiveness of art. 22.3 of the Patent Law either.

4) The additional feature in claim 4 is disclosed in ref. 1. When at least one of the input signals is true (non-single ended zero state), the output from the NOR gate will be false (the second output state). When claim 1, 2 or 3 referred to has no inventiveness, claim 4 does not have inventiveness of art. 22.3 of the Patent Law either.

(II)

1. The description shall include five parts of technical field, background art, content of the invention, description of figures and mode of carrying out the invention, and each of the parts shall be preceded by a heading. The applicant should make the amendment to comply with rule 18.2 of the Implementing Regulations of the Patent Law.

2. (This item relates to the expression in the Chinese version, which will be dealt with by us—the agent’s note.)

Based on the above reasons, this application cannot be granted a patent right on the basis of the present text. The applicant should submit the new claims and description according to the above comments within the time limit prescribed in this office action. Please note that the amendments to the application documents shall be in conformity with art. 33 of the Patent Law and shall not go beyond the disclosure contained in the initial description and claims. After amending the claims, the applicant should also make the adaptive amendment to the description. Please respond according to the above comments, otherwise, the submitted text may not be accepted.